

Critical Phenomena, Modular Invariants and Operator Algebras

David E Evans

School of Mathematics
University of Wales Cardiff
PO Box 926, Senghennydd Road
Cardiff CF24 4YH, Wales, UK

February 8, 2008

Abstract

We review the framework subfactors provide for understanding modular invariants. We discuss the structure of a generalized Longo-Rehren subfactor and the relationship between the coupling matrices of such subfactors, modular invariance and local extensions. We relate results of Kostant, in the context of the McKay correspondence for finite subgroups of $SU(2)$, to subfactors. A direct proof of how α -induction produces modular invariants is presented.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	On the structure of a generalized Longo-Rehren subfactor	12
2.1	Maximal local extensions	12
2.2	On Δ -induction	14
3	Finite groups and the McKay correspondence	16
3.1	Background	16
3.2	Kostant's result	17
3.3	Relating Kostant's result to subfactors	18
3.4	A modular invariant from a group	19
4	How to prove $YZ = ZY$ without the double triangle algebra	20

1 Introduction

Noncommutative operator algebras provide a framework, via the transfer matrices, for understanding classical statistical mechanics and their phase transitions. This

has led to connections with subfactor theory, via hyperfinite II_1 subfactors. Basically, algebras generated by larger and larger partition functions with subalgebras generated by those partition functions with certain boundary conditions. The statistical mechanical models provide at criticality conformal field theory models - the relevant conformal symmetry described by loop groups, e.g those of $SU(n)$ or coset models. These provide hyperfinite III_1 subfactors [88]. The link between the two subfactor theories is mathematically via the classification results of Popa [75] relating the type II_1 picture of Jones-Wenzl Hecke subfactors and the type III_1 setting of Jones-Wassermann loop group subfactors and physically via the partition functions. Weyl duality, in its deformation, relates the representation theory of the symmetric group and the Hecke algebras at roots of unity $q = e^{2\pi i/(n+k)}$ to that of the classical group $SU(n)$ quantum group $SU(n)_k$ at the same root of unity and the positive energy representations of the loop group of $SU(n)$ at level k . Physically, we are trying to relate the study of the associated modular invariant partition functions of the statistical mechanical model at criticality and of the corresponding conformal field theories.

We start the story in more detail on the statistical mechanical side, and for definiteness the classical Ising model on a two dimensional square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$. Configuration space is distributions of two symbols $\pm$, representing spin up/down or occupied/unoccupied in the lattice gas picture. The Hamiltonian H is the nearest neighbour Hamiltonian. Integrability of the model is effected mathematically by the star-triangle relation or the Yang-Baxter equation of the Boltzmann weights or commutativity of the strip transfer matrices. The transfer matrix T is obtained for the partition function of a strip of finite length M and width one lattice spacing. With boundary conditions ξ, η along the two lengths the corresponding partition function $T_{\xi\eta}$ defines for us the transfer matrix T . The partition function Z of a finite rectangular lattice of length M and width N is then obtained by multiplying the strip partition functions, namely transfer matrix entries and summing over internal edges. For periodic boundary conditions we obtain

$$Z = \sum_{\sigma} \exp(-\beta H(\sigma)) = \sum_{\xi_i} T_{\xi_1 \xi_2} T_{\xi_2 \xi_3} \dots T_{\xi_N \xi_1} = \text{trace } T^N. \quad (1)$$

So we move from the classical model with commutative space $\mathcal{P}$ and Ising Hamiltonian H to the noncommutative algebra, the Fermi or Pauli algebra $\otimes M_2$, and one dimensional quantum Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$, where $e^{-\mathcal{H}} = T$ the transfer matrix and time development $\sigma_t = \text{Ad}(T^{-it}) = \text{Ad}(e^{i\mathcal{H}t})$ and corresponding ground states. The first step in this movement is a noncommutative computation of the partition function $Z = \text{tr} T^N$ of the $M \times N$ rectangle (so that as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we pick up the ground states [29]).

The Ising model can be generalized to integrable models associated with $SU(n)$. The product action of $SU(n)$ on $\otimes M_n$ has a fixed point algebra generated by permutations of the tensor factors, or certain representation of the symmetric group. This Weyl duality and its deformation is at the heart of the relation between the

$SU(n)$ loop group picture, hyperfinite III_1 factors, superselection sectors and conformal quantum field theory on the one hand and the Hecke algebra picture, hyperfinite II_1 factors, bimodules and classical statistical mechanics on the other. Deforming this Weyl duality, the "fixed points" of the quantum group action of $SU(n)_q$ on $\bigotimes_{\mathbb{N}} M_n$ is identified with a representation of the Hecke algebra $H(q, m)$ with generators g_i , $i = 1, 2 \dots m$ and quadratic relations $(q^{-1} - g_j)(q + g_j) = 0$ and braid relations $g_i g_{i+1} g_i = g_{i+1} g_i g_{i+1}$, $g_i g_j = g_j g_i$, $|i - j| > 1$. This duality relates the labelling of the irreducible representations of $SU(n)$, (Young tableaux with fewer than m rows), and the truncations to level k positive energy irreducible representations of the loop group of $SU(n)$ (with the further restriction to at most k columns) with the labelling of the irreducible representations of the symmetric group which appear when permuting the tensor factors, and the cut down when $q = e^{2\pi i/(n+k)}$ is a root of unity. Let us denote either by $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}^{(n,k)}$. The Ising Boltzman weights lie naturally in the Pauli algebra $\bigotimes M_2$ when $q = e^{i\pi/4}$. The Yang-Baxter equation at criticality reduces to the braid relation. The Ising model was generalized by Andrews, Baxter and Forrester [1], Date, Jimbo, Miwa, and Okado [19] (to $SU(2)$, $SU(n)$ respectively) so that the integrable Boltzman weights now lie in $\bigotimes M_n$. The natural labels for the states at each site of the lattice is now $\mathcal{A}^{(n,k)}$, and configuration space consists of distributions of edges from the fusion graph $\mathcal{A}^{(n,k)}$ on a square lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$.

At criticality, the partition function Z on a torus can be written as $Z(\tau) = \text{tr}(e^{-\beta H} e^{i\eta P})$ where $2\pi i\tau = -\beta + i\eta$ parameterizes the metric of the torus. The partition function of the statistical mechanical model can be expressed as an average over $e^{-\beta H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ the Hamiltonian, is now $L_0 + \bar{L}_0 - c/12$ (the shift by $c/24$ arising from mapping the Virasoro algebra on the plane to a cylinder). Here L_0 ($\bar{L}_0$) generate the rotation groups which act on the underlying loop groups, and also we have a momentum P ($= L_0 - \bar{L}_0$) describing evolution along the closed string. So taking both evolutions into account, we compute

$$Z(\tau) = \text{tr}(e^{-\beta \mathcal{H}} e^{i\eta P}) = \text{tr}(e^{2\pi i\tau(L_0 - c/24)} e^{-2\pi i\bar{\tau}(\bar{L}_0 - c/24)}). \quad (2)$$

Decomposing according to representation theory of the loop group symmetry, the partition function breaks up as:

$$\mathcal{Z}(\tau) = \sum_{\lambda, \mu} Z_{\lambda, \mu} \chi_{\lambda}(\tau) \chi_{\mu}(\tau)^*. \quad (3)$$

We want to understand the modular invariant partition function, their realization and classification.

In the III_1 factor setting, we have such a factor N endowed with a braided system of endomorphisms ${}_N \mathcal{X}_N$ - the braiding in the loop group examples arise from rotating and possibly dilating an interval I onto its complement. Modular invariants enter the picture when we start to look at compatible subfactors $N \subset M$, when if ι denotes the corresponding inclusion then the irreducible components of the dual canonical endomorphism $\theta = \bar{\iota}$ lie in ${}_N \mathcal{X}_N$. This setting was initiated by Feng Xu [90] for conformal embeddings where a certain chiral locality holds and taken up by Böckenhauer and Evans [7, 8, 9] for amongst other things simple current or orbifold

invariants and some coset models and by Böckenhauer, Evans and Kawahigashi in [8, 9] for so called type II invariants when chiral locality can fail. Xu began the ball rolling in using the method of Longo-Rehren for inducing sectors of N to those of M . This is a formulation of Mackey induction, indeed the Longo-Rehren induction reduces precisely to this in the case of group-subgroup subfactors $R^G \subset R^H$ [7]. An outer finite group action on a hyperfinite factor can be recovered from the position of the fixed point algebra $R^G \subset R$. For a group-subgroup subfactor $R^G \subset R^H$ one can not recover uniquely the subgroup H [57, 51]. Nevertheless, we think of the subfactor as providing a mechanism for understanding the quotient G/H even when H is not normal. An inclusion of a subfactor in a factor has a rich combinatorial structure which can be described by a quantisation of a symmetry group or a paragroup in the language of Ocneanu [66, 29]. Jones [54] found that the minimal algebraic structure realising this quantum symmetry was the Temperley–Lieb algebra or quantum $SU(2)$.

The induction is given by: $\alpha_\lambda^\pm = \bar{\tau}^{-1} \circ \text{Ad}(\varepsilon^\pm(\lambda, \theta)) \circ \lambda \circ \bar{\tau}$, where ε is the braiding, so that α_λ an endomorphism on M extends λ in ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ on N , $\alpha_\lambda \iota = \iota \lambda$. The map $[\lambda] \rightarrow [\alpha_\lambda^\pm]$ is multiplicative, additive and preserves conjugation on sectors. The more naive induction $\lambda \rightarrow \bar{\tau} \lambda \iota = \lambda'$ is not multiplicative as for example $d_{\lambda'} = d_\theta d_\lambda$ is inconsistent with multiplicativity. We somehow need to divide out by θ and α -induction, in the presence of a braiding does this so that $\alpha_\lambda \iota \bar{\tau} = \bar{\tau} \lambda \iota$.

We will assume initially that braiding on the system ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ is non-degenerate. In this case there is a natural representation of the modular group $SL(2; \mathbb{Z})$ where the standard generators S and T matrices are basically given by the Hopf link and twist respectively. More precisely, recall that the statistics phase of ω_λ for $\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ is given as $d_\lambda \phi_\lambda(\varepsilon^+(\lambda, \lambda)) = \omega_\lambda \mathbf{1}$, where the state ϕ_λ is the left inverse of λ . We set $z = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} d_\lambda^2 \omega_\lambda$. If $z \neq 0$ we put $c = 4 \arg(z)/\pi$, which is the central charge defined modulo 8. The S -matrix is defined by

$$S_{\lambda, \mu} = \frac{1}{|z|} \sum_{\rho \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \frac{\omega_\lambda \omega_\mu}{\omega_\rho} N_{\lambda, \mu}^\rho d_\rho, \quad \lambda, \mu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N,$$

with $N_{\lambda, \mu}^\rho = \langle \rho, \lambda \mu \rangle$ denoting the fusion coefficients [76, 32, 31]. (As usual, the label 0 refers to the identity morphism $\text{id} \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N$.) Let T be the diagonal matrix with entries $T_{\lambda, \mu} = e^{-i\pi c/12} \omega_\lambda \delta_{\lambda \mu}$. Then this pair of S and T matrices satisfy $TSTST = S$ and give a unitary representation of the modular group $SL(2; \mathbb{Z})$ [76, 85]. Following a study of examples in [9], we put $Z_{\lambda, \mu} = \langle \alpha_\lambda^+, \alpha_\mu^- \rangle$, with the right hand side interpreted as multiplicities of common sectors in the two inductions, defines a matrix with positive integral entries normalized at the vacuum, $Z_{0,0} = 1$. This matrix commutes with S and T and consequently, Z gives a modular invariant [13]. (In the case of degenerate braidings, we would define matrices Y and Ω , where we remove the factors, $1/|z|$, and $e^{-i\pi c/12}$, from the above expressions for S and T respectively. Then we only have the partial relations $\Omega Y \Omega Y \Omega = zY$, but nevertheless, $\langle \alpha_\lambda^+, \alpha_\mu^- \rangle$ still commutes with Y and Ω).

A modular invariant is said to be *sufferable* if it arises in this way from a subfactor through the process of α -induction. As we shall point out here again in this paper, there do exist *insufferable* modular invariants which cannot be realised in this way.

A simple argument of Gannon [40] shows that there are finitely many modular invariants for a given modular data. Indeed he has the estimate $\sum_{\lambda,\mu} Z_{\lambda,\mu} \leq 1/S_{0,0}^2$ which can be refined [11] to the inequality $Z_{\lambda,\mu} \leq d_\lambda d_\mu$ for each entry of the mass matrix. There is always the diagonal matrix solution. In some sense according to Moore and Seiberg [64] every modular invariant is of this form when looked at properly. That is at least when the system $\mathcal{A}$ is expanded to an extended system $\mathcal{B}$ and up to a twist ϑ of the extended fusion rules of $\mathcal{B}$. So taking the twisted diagonal modular invariant or permutation invariant for the $\mathcal{B}$ system

$$Z^{\text{ext}} = \sum_{\tau} \chi_{\tau} \bar{\chi}_{\vartheta(\tau)}, \quad (4)$$

and restricting to the original system $\chi_{\tau} = \sum_{\lambda} b_{\tau,\lambda} \chi_{\lambda}$, we have:

$$Z_{\lambda,\mu} = \sum_{\tau} b_{\tau,\lambda} b_{\vartheta(\tau),\mu}. \quad (5)$$

When no twist is necessary, so that

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{B}} |\chi_{\tau}|^2 = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{B}} \left| \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{A}} b_{\tau\lambda} \chi_{\lambda} \right|^2, \quad (6)$$

$$Z_{\lambda\mu} = \sum_{\tau} b_{\tau\lambda} b_{\tau\mu}, \quad (7)$$

then the modular invariant is said to be type I. In such a case, the modular invariant is automatically symmetric $Z_{\lambda,\mu} = Z_{\mu,\lambda}$. In the presence of a non trivial twist, the modular invariant is said to be type II. In the type II case, the modular invariant Z may not be symmetric (although in the case of $SU(n)$ all known modular invariants are symmetric even though not all are type I) but there is symmetric vacuum coupling: $Z_{\lambda,0} = Z_{0,\lambda}$. This is not enough to handle all modular invariants – some are not symmetric – e.g. for the loop groups of orthogonal groups at low levels [44, 10] or quantum doubles of some finite groups [18, 30]. In this case, which one may call type III, we need different extensions or labellings on the right and left $\mathcal{B}^{\pm}$.

Such an extension theory has been developed rigorously in the subfactor context in [10]. At the same time a better understanding was developed in [10] of the fundamental formula proposed in [9] for $Z_{\lambda,\mu} = \langle \alpha_{\lambda}^{+}, \alpha_{\mu}^{-} \rangle$. We write this in matrix form, $Z = b^{+*} b^{-}$, where $b^{\pm}$ are the matrices of the chiral branching coefficients

$$b_{\tau,\lambda}^{\pm} = \langle \tau, \alpha_{\lambda}^{\pm} \rangle, \quad \tau \in \mathcal{B}, \quad \lambda \in \mathcal{A}. \quad (8)$$

Here $\mathcal{B}$ are certain induced braided neutral endomorphisms of the factor M , where there are extended S^{ext} and T^{ext} matrices associated to the extended system. Then the branching coefficient matrices $b^{\pm}$ intertwine the two representations of $SL(2; \mathbb{Z})$: $S^{\text{ext}} b^{\pm} = b^{\pm} S$, $T^{\text{ext}} b^{\pm} = b^{\pm} T$. However, this does raise further questions, since this means that certain modular invariants e.g. some associated to orthogonal groups at low order are insufferable – they cannot be realised by subfactors. See e.g. Section 5 of [12] for a discussion on this. A sufferable modular invariant with associated

subfactor produces intermediate subfactors $N \subset M_{\pm} \subset M$ where neutral sectors of endomorphisms $\mathcal{B}^{\pm}$ of $M_{\pm}$ are the natural left and right chiral labelling producing type I parent modular invariants $Z^{\pm} = b^{\pm*}b^{\pm}$, and the identification of $\mathcal{B}^+$ with $\mathcal{B}^-$, relating b^+ with b^- , is the twist which yields the original modular invariant. It may happen that $M_+ \neq M_-$, and this can even happen with symmetric modular invariants for $SU(n)$ [10, 26].

When we start from a braided system of endomorphisms ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ on a III_1 factor N , and a subfactor $N \subset M$ where the dual canonical endomorphism is generated by ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$, we can induce to systems of sectors ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^{\pm}$ on M . We can then form the system ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^{\alpha} = {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^+ \vee {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^-$ and ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M$ as a system of endomorphisms for the irreducible subsectors of $\{\iota\lambda\bar{\iota} : \lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N\}$ on M . For conformal embeddings, where the extended sectors are given by those of the ambient loop group, which is clearly non-degenerately braided, it was shown in [9], that the following conditions are equivalent:

- the mass matrix $Z_{\lambda,\mu}$ can be recovered from α -induction as $\langle \alpha_{\lambda}^+, \alpha_{\mu}^- \rangle$,
- the neutral sectors ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0 = {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^+ \cap {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^-$ are identical with the extended sectors,
- ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M = {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^+ \vee {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^-$.

There were also analogous statements for simple current invariants [9], and in either case, these conditions were shown to be valid for many cases. It was then subsequently shown in [13], that if the system ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ is non-degenerately braided, then we have the generating property ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^{\alpha} = {}_M\mathcal{X}_M$ (and hence the equivalent conditions of [9] hold). A more algebraic proof of the generating property which does not rely on graphical arguments and the double triangle algebra was established in [10]. In the same spirit, we give an algebraic proof in Section 4, that the mass matrix Z commutes with the S matrix, and is consequently a modular invariant as a simple argument of [10, Lemma 6.1]) already gives commutativity with T . Now in general, the induced systems, ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^{\pm}$ are not braided or even commutative. Indeed the complexifications of the finite dimensional C^* -algebras they generate are given as [14] using the branching coefficients:

$$\text{Fur}({}_M\mathcal{X}_M^{\pm}) \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \bigoplus_{\tau \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0} \text{Mat}(b_{\tau,\lambda}^{\pm}). \quad (9)$$

In particular, the induced systems are noncommutative only when the branching coefficients are all at most 1. The first noncommutative example was computed by hand by Feng Xu [90], for the conformal embedding $SU(4)_4 \subset SU(15)_1$, but we see that this is just the first of a series of noncommutative examples from $SU(n)_n \subset SU(n^2 - 1)_1$. So naturally, using α -induction, we have an action or nimrep (i.e. a matrix representation where all the matrix entries are non-negative integers) of the original fusion rules of ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ on ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^{\pm}$. However, this does not yield the correct graph in general. Computing dimensions in Eq. (9) we see that the number of irreducible components of ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^{\pm}$ is given by $\text{tr}Z^{\pm}$ - which only sees the type I parents of the

original invariant. Consider the three modular invariants associated with the Dynkin diagrams A_{17} , D_{10} and E_7 for $SU(2)$ at level 16:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Z}_{A_{17}} &= \sum_{\lambda=0}^{16} |\chi_\lambda|^2 \\ \mathcal{Z}_{D_{10}} &= |\chi_0 + \chi_{16}|^2 + |\chi_2 + \chi_{14}|^2 + |\chi_4 + \chi_{12}|^2 + |\chi_6 + \chi_{10}|^2 + 2|\chi_8|^2, \\ \mathcal{Z}_{E_7} &= |\chi_0 + \chi_{16}|^2 + |\chi_4 + \chi_{12}|^2 + |\chi_6 + \chi_{10}|^2 + |\chi_8|^2 \\ &\quad + (\chi_2 + \chi_{14})\chi_8^* + \chi_8(\chi_2 + \chi_{14})^*.\end{aligned}$$

For either $\mathcal{Z}_{D_{10}}$ or $\mathcal{Z}_{E_7}$ we would only get 10 sectors which would force D_{10} to be the fusion graphs of ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$. To distinguish the two invariants, we need to consider not only N - N sectors ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ and M - M sectors ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M$ but also M - N sectors ${}_M\mathcal{X}_N$ given by irreducible components of $\{\iota\lambda : \lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N\}$. The left action of ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M$ on ${}_M\mathcal{X}_N$ defines a representation ϱ of the M - M fusion rule algebra, and decomposes as [13, 14]

$$\varrho \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \pi_{\lambda,\lambda}.$$

Here $\pi_{\lambda,\lambda}$ is the irreducible representation corresponding to the matrix block $\text{Mat}(Z_{\lambda,\lambda})$, $\pi_{\lambda,\lambda}([\alpha_\nu^\pm]) = S_{\lambda,\nu}/S_{\lambda,0} \mathbf{1}_{Z_{\lambda,\lambda}}$ in the diagonalisation of the complexification of the fusion rule algebra of ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$ (also provided that the braiding on ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ is non-degenerate):

$$\text{Fur}({}_M\mathcal{X}_M) \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda,\mu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \text{Mat}(Z_{\lambda,\mu}). \quad (10)$$

In particular the spectrum is determined by the diagonal part of the modular invariant. Thus it is precisely this representation ϱ which provides an automatic connection between the modular invariant and fusion graphs (e.g. the representation matrix of some fundamental generator $\square$ corresponding to the left multiplication of $[\alpha_\square^\pm]$ on the M - N sectors) in such a way that (the multiplicities in) their spectra are canonically given by the diagonal entries of the coupling matrix. In fact, evaluation of ϱ on the $[\alpha_\lambda^\pm]$'s yields a nimrep of the original N - N fusion rules.

We say a modular invariant is *nimble* if there exists a nimrep $\{G_\lambda : \lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N\}$ whose spectrum reproduces the diagonal part of the modular invariant $\sigma(G_\lambda) = \{S_{\lambda\mu}/S_{\mu 0} \text{ with multiplicity } Z_{\mu\mu}\}$. A sufferable modular invariant is clearly nimble by [13], but not all modular invariants are nimble and there do exist nimble insufferable modular invariants [30].

Finally, by counting dimensions we see that $\#{}_M\mathcal{X}_N = \text{tr}(Z)$. Thus for $SU(2)$ at level 16 we have $\text{tr}\mathcal{Z}_{D_{10}} = 10$, $\text{tr}\mathcal{Z}_{E_7} = 7$, so that we would get the correct E_7 graph for the E_7 modular invariant here. For the situation where chiral locality holds as for D_{10} , we can identify both ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$ with ${}_N\mathcal{X}_M$ (by $\beta \mapsto \beta \circ \iota$, $\beta \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$) so that there is no difference here with the first cruder computation.

It may be useful here to list the exceptional invariants for $SU(2)$, $SU(3)$, $SU(4)$ - i.e. the ones which are not diagonal, orbifold or simple current invariants or their conjugates. If Z is a modular invariant, then $Z^c = ZC = CZ$ is also a modular invariant as $C = S^2$, called the conjugate of Z which may differ from Z . Also,

first for the record all $SU(n)_k$ conformal embeddings are:

$$\begin{aligned}
SU(n)_{n-2} &\subset SU(n(n-1)/2)_1 \text{ (only gives exceptionals for } n \geq 5); \\
SU(n)_n &\subset SO(n^2-1)_1 \text{ (only gives exceptionals for } n \geq 4); \\
SU(n)_{n+2} &\subset SU(n(n+1)/2)_1 \text{ (only gives exceptionals for } n \geq 3); \\
SU(2)_{10} &\subset SO(5)_1; \quad SU(2)_{28} \subset (G_2)_1; \\
SU(3)_9 &\subset (E_6)_1; \quad SU(3)_{21} \subset (E_7)_1; \\
SU(4)_8 &\subset SO(20)_1; \quad SU(6)_6 \subset Sp(20)_1; \quad SU(8)_{10} \subset SO(70)_1.
\end{aligned}$$

$SU(2)$

- $E_6, SU(2)_{10} \subset SO(5)_1$
- $E_8, SU(2)_{28} \subset (G_2)_1$
- E_7 , automorphism or twist of the orbifold invariant $D_{10} = SU(2)_{16}/\mathbb{Z}_2$

$SU(3)$

- $SU(3)_3 \subset SO(8)_1$, also realised as an orbifold $SU(3)_3/\mathbb{Z}_3$
- $\mathcal{E}^{(8)}, SU(3)_5 \subset SU(6)_1$, plus conjugate $\mathcal{E}^{(8)c} = \mathcal{E}^{(8)}/\mathbb{Z}_5$
- $\mathcal{E}^{(12)}, SU(3)_9 \subset (E_6)_1$, with two nimreps, $\mathcal{E}^{(12)}$, and $\mathcal{E}^{(12)}/\mathbb{Z}_3$,
- $\mathcal{E}^{(24)}, SU(3)_{21} \subset (E_7)_1$
- $\mathcal{E}_{MS}^{(12)}$ Moore-Seiberg invariant, automorphism or twist of the orbifold invariant $SU(3)_9/\mathbb{Z}_3$, plus conjugate $\mathcal{E}_{MS}^{(12)c}$

$SU(4)$

- $\mathcal{E}^{(8)} SU(4)_4 \subset SO(15)_1$
- $\mathcal{E}^{(10)} SU(4)_6 \subset SU(10)_1$, plus conjugate $\mathcal{E}^{(10)c} = \mathcal{E}^{(10)}/\mathbb{Z}_5$
- $\mathcal{E}^{(12)} SU(4)_8 \subset SO(20)_1$
- $\mathcal{E}_{aut}^{(12)} SU(4)_8$: automorphism or twist of the orbifold invariant $SU(4)_8/\mathbb{Z}_4$

Of course apart from trying to realise modular invariants by subfactors or vice versa one would like to classify all modular invariants for a given modular data, and understand the relevant subfactors which can be used to realise them through the process of α -induction.

Cappelli, Itzykson and Zuber [17] classified $SU(2)$ modular invariants by ADE Dynkin diagrams whose exponents or eigenvalues describe the diagonal part of the

invariant. Such graphs are obtained from the McKay graphs for finite subgroups of $SU(2)$, the affine Dynkin diagrams. Di Francesco and Zuber [22] understood the ADE classification of $SU(2)$ modular invariants [17] in terms of nimreps. They were very successful in pursuing this line in trying to label the known $SU(3)$ modular invariants (subsequently classified by Gannon [41]) with graphs whose eigenvalues described the diagonal part of the modular invariant, partly guided by the list of McKay fusion graphs for finite subgroups of $SU(3)$. There is a mismatch between the lists of $SU(3)$ modular invariants and finite subgroups of $SU(3)$ but they are very close and this "correspondence" was a significant tool. As n increases, then the number of finite subgroups of $SU(n)$ increases, but the corresponding number of exceptional modular invariants appears to decrease. They succeeded, for $SU(3)$, in finding graphs and nimreps for the orbifold invariants, and the exceptional invariants, (with three candidates for the conformal embedding $SU(3)_9 \subset (E_6)_1$ invariant). All these graphs were three-colourable, and they conjectured this to be the case for all $SU(3)$ modular invariants. Meanwhile, an ADE classification of subfactors of index less than four was obtained by Ocneanu [66] with published proofs by others (see [29] for detailed citations). Here D_{odd} and E_7 are missing from this classification as they do not appear as the principal graphs of any subfactor. These correspond to the type II modular invariants in the corresponding ADE classification. The orbifold construction was brought into the subfactor picture in [27], and followed up in [55, 89]. It should be noticed that the flat part of the E_7 connection was computed to be D_{10} in [28], motivated by the fact that the E_7 modular invariant was a twist on the orbifold D_{10} invariant. These were pieces of a jigsaw relating the classification of $SU(n)$ modular invariants with $SU(n)$ subfactors, but the overall picture was fragmented.

Looking further into the subfactor connections, Ocneanu [67] produced the nimreps, chiral and full graphs for the $SU(2)$ invariants using the bimodule and his double triangle approach. Feng Xu [90] looked at the conformal embedding invariants in the loop group setting of [88], taking as principal tool the α -induction of Longo-Rehren [63]. In particular he computed the chiral graphs for the E_6 , E_8 for $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)_3 \subset SO(8)_1$, $\mathcal{E}^{(8)}$, $\mathcal{E}^{(12)}$, $\mathcal{E}^{(24)}$ for $SU(3)$, and $\mathcal{E}^{(8)}$, $SU(4)_4 \subset SO(15)_1$ for $SU(4)$, and $SU(4)_3 \subset SU(10)_1$. Böckenhauer and Evans [7, 8, 9] pursuing the α -induction approach also brought the simple current invariants into the game and so computed the chiral graphs and full graphs in the orbifold cases D_{even} , as well as the full graphs in the case of E_6 , E_8 . It only then became clear that the classification obtained by Ocneanu of irreducible connections on the ADE Dynkin diagrams which form a fusion ring with connection generators W and $\overline{W}$ was related to the induced full M - M system with generators α_1^+ and α_1^- . The precise relation between the bimodule approach of Ocneanu and that of α -induction is explained mathematically in [13]. The principal and dual principal graphs could be computed from the induced systems, e.g. the dual principal graph for the conformal embedding $\mathcal{E}^{(8)}$: $SU(3)_5 \subset SU(6)_1$ was computed for the first time [9]. The centre $\mathbb{Z}_n$ of $SU(n)$ acts on the algebra $N = \pi_0(L_I SU(n))''$, for say the vacuum level k representation, for the $SU(n)$ valued loops concentrated on an interval I on a circle. We can form the crossed product subfactor $N(I) \subset N(I) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_n$, which will recover the orbifold modular

invariants, but this extended system is only local if and only if $k \in 2n\mathbb{N}$ if n is even and $k \in n\mathbb{N}$ if n is odd [8], precisely when the corresponding modular invariants are type I. They also started to consider the modular invariants of the extended $U(1)$ current algebras as treated in [16] and the minimal model modular invariants which arise from coset theories $(SU(2)_{m-2} \otimes SU(2)_1)/SU(2)_{m-1}$ and are labelled by pairs $(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ of ADE graphs, associated to levels $(m-2, m-1)$, which arise from fusion graphs from α -induction. See [56] for the latest developments.

The situation when chiral locality [9] fails was taken by Böckenhauer, Evans and Kawahigashi [14]. In particular they realised the E_7 invariant for $SU(2)$ through a subfactor, computed the full system, as well as the full system for D_{odd} . Previously, at a purely algebraic level, Böckenhauer and Evans [25] had constructed the nimrep for the E_7 type Moore Seiberg invariant, a twist of an orbifold invariant, for $SU(3)$ without realising the subfactor - but it is the sufferability of such invariants which is of main interest not simply constructing a nimrep. Böckenhauer and Evans [6] understood that nimrep graphs for the conjugate $SU(2)$ modular invariants were not three colourable. This was also realised simultaneously by Behrend, Pearce, Petkova and Zuber [3] and Ocneanu [68]. Indeed Ocneanu announced in Bariloche [68] that all $SU(3)$ modular invariants are sufferable, and the classification of their associated nimreps. Böckenhauer and Evans [11] realised all modular invariants for cyclic $\mathbb{Z}_n$ theories, in particular charge conjugation. This could be used to understand and realise $SU(3)_9 \subset (E_6)_1$, with two nimreps. One was $\mathcal{E}^{(12)}$ through of course the $SU(3)_9 \subset (E_6)_1$ standard conformal embedding, and another the orbifold $\mathcal{E}^{(12)}/\mathbb{Z}_3$ obtained from the subfactor $SU(3)_9 \subset (E_6)_1 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_3$. The extension $(E_6)_1 \subset (E_6)_1 \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_3$ describing charge conjugation on the cyclic $\mathbb{Z}_6$ system for $(E_6)_1$. The analogous construction for $SU(4)$ does not degenerate in this way as the modular invariant $\mathcal{E}^{(10)}$: $SU(4)_6 \subset SU(10)_1$, is not self conjugate, and so the fusion graph for the conjugate modular invariant is the $\mathbb{Z}_5$ orbifold [11]. A nimrep for the conformal embedding invariant $\mathcal{E}^{(10)}$: $SU(4)_6 \subset SU(10)_1$ had been computed in [71]. For other reviews and further results see [11, 12].

On the physical side the role of nimreps became clearer through the work first of Behrend, Pearce, Petkova and Zuber [3] on boundary conformal field theory bCFT and later Petkova and Zuber [72, 73], particularly in the use of twisted partition functions and its relation to the Ocneanu approach. On the other hand the α -induction approach or formulation was taken up on the physical side by Fuchs and Schweigert [37, 38] and adapted to their approach to bCFT.

Returning to our decomposition of modular invariants through intermediate subfactors, the situation is summarised [9] using recent work of Rehren [80] on canonical tensor product subfactors as determining a generalized Longo Rehren LR subfactor with a maximal intermediate extension,

$$Q = N \otimes N^{\text{opp}} \subset M_+ \otimes M_-^{\text{opp}} \subset R, \quad (11)$$

where the irreducible sector decomposition of the dual canonical endomorphism Θ of $Q \subset R$ is described by Z Eq. (12), and Θ^{ext} of $M_+ \otimes M_-^{\text{opp}} \subset R$ by Z^{ext} .

There is a connection between the two chiral inductions and the picture of left- and right-chiral algebras in conformal field theory. Suppose that our factor N is obtained as a local factor $N = N(I_o)$ of a quantum field theoretical net of factors $\{N(I)\}$ indexed by proper intervals $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ on the real line, and that the system ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ is obtained as restrictions of DHR-morphisms (cf. [49]) to N . This is in fact the case in our examples arising from conformal field theory where the net is defined in terms of local loop groups in the vacuum representation. Taking two copies of such a net and placing the real axes on the light cone, then this defines a local net $\{A(\mathcal{O})\}$, indexed by double cones $\mathcal{O}$ on two-dimensional Minkowski space (cf. [79] for such constructions). Given a subfactor $N \subset M$, determining in turn two subfactors $N \subset M_\pm$ obeying chiral locality, will provide two local nets of subfactors $\{N(I) \subset M_\pm(I)\}$ as a local subfactor basically encodes the entire information about the net of subfactors [63]. Arranging $M_+(I)$ and $M_-(J)$ on the two light cone axes defines a local net of subfactors $\{A(\mathcal{O}) \subset A_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{O})\}$ in Minkowski space. The embedding $M_+ \otimes M_-^{\text{opp}} \subset B$ gives rise to another net of subfactors $\{A_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{O}) \subset B(\mathcal{O})\}$, where the net $\{B(\mathcal{O})\}$ obeys local commutation relations. The existence of the local net was already proven in [80], and now the decomposition of $[\Theta_{\text{ext}}]$ tells us that the chiral extensions $N(I) \subset M_+(I)$ and $N(I) \subset M_-(I)$ for left and right chiral nets are indeed maximal (in the sense of [79]), following from the fact that the coupling matrix for $\{A_{\text{ext}}(\mathcal{O}) \subset B(\mathcal{O})\}$ is a bijection. This shows that the inclusions $N \subset M_\pm$ should in fact be regarded as the subfactor version of left- and right maximal extensions of the chiral algebra.

The extension Eq. (11) basically ensures the existence of a corresponding two dimensional rational conformal field theory 2D-RCFT [80]. The coupling matrix Z is automatically Ω - and Y -invariant [13]. Crucial for the understanding of classifications of 2D-RCFT's and braided subfactors is now the converse direction: If we have generalized LR-subfactor $Q \subset R$ (relative to a braided system), i.e. a 2D-RCFT, does this also imply the existence of some braided subfactor $N \subset M$ such that its α -induction coupling matrix reproduces the Θ of $Q \subset R$? A proper answer to this question would clarify why for RCFT's the diagonals are exponents of graphs etc. This question is not easy. The first problem is that we cannot expect a unique subfactor $N \subset M$ because different subfactors can produce the same Z , see [14, 11, 12] and the changing the ι -vertex argument [26]. The next problem is that even a generalized LR subfactor which satisfies the 2D locality condition produces a coupling matrix which is Ω -invariant but which does not necessarily commute with Y . The most trivial example is the trivial (and hence local) inclusion $Q = R$ which gives $Z_{\lambda,\mu} = \delta_{\lambda,0}\delta_{\mu,0}$ which is obviously Ω - but not Y -invariant. (Rehren has a less trivial example for $SU(2)_k$: There is a local $Q \subset R$ such that the only non-zero entries of Z are $= 1$ on the diagonal for even spins. The locality condition is possibly equivalent to but at least should imply Ω -invariance of the coupling matrix.) However, it follows from Proposition 2.1 that the inclusions $N \subset M_\pm$ determined by $Q \subset R$ are braided subfactors and hence produce Ω - and Y -invariant (parent) coupling matrices but which can (and often are) different from the coupling matrix describing Θ . (These are however trivial as $N = M_\pm$ for the sketched examples.) So the question

is: When does a generalized LR subfactor $Q \subset R$ with coupling matrix Z determine some braided subfactor $N \subset M$ giving Z by α -induction? Is it enough to require Y -invariance? (Besides locality ensuring Ω -invariance.)

Clearly Lie groups, and their loop groups, provide clear examples for studying modular data and modular invariants. However, finite discrete groups as we have already mentioned, have a role to play in this theory - from finite subgroups at least of $SU(2)$ and $SU(3)$. This aspect will be further discussed in Section 3 when we relate the approach of Kostant [59] to our subfactor approach. Apart from loop group or quantum group examples, modular data can also be obtained in the subfactor context through the use of the quantum double subfactor, just as one can produce R -matrices from any Hopf algebra through the double construction of Drinfeld. Thus the quantum doubles of finite groups provide a fascinating testing ground [30] for testing whether structure or coincidences which we have discovered in the quantum group subfactors, carry over to more general braided subfactors and their corresponding modular invariants.

2 On the structure of a generalized Longo-Rehren subfactor

Here we collect some considerations about the relation between braided subfactors and generalized Longo-Rehren (LR) subfactors. Roughly speaking, the trivial subfactor $N \subset N$, as producing the diagonal coupling matrix, corresponds to the usual LR subfactor. More interesting are non-trivial inclusions $N \subset M$ producing non-diagonal coupling matrices and corresponding to *generalized* LR subfactors.

2.1 Maximal local extensions

The following will demonstrate that a generalized LR subfactor gives naturally the local extensions factor $M_{\pm}$.

Let N be a type III factor with a system ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ of endomorphisms, and let $Q = N \otimes N^{\text{opp}}$. We consider a subfactor $Q \subset R$ such that the corresponding dual canonical endomorphism is decomposed as

$$[\Theta] = \bigoplus_{\lambda, \mu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} Z_{\lambda, \mu} [\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}}], \quad (12)$$

i.e. $Q \subset R$ is a canonical tensor product subfactor [79, 80]. Let $\iota_{\text{LR}} : Q \hookrightarrow R$ be the injection homomorphism, so that $\Theta = \bar{\iota}_{\text{LR}} \iota_{\text{LR}}$, and choose orthonormal bases of isometries

$$\Psi_{\lambda, \mu; i} \in \text{Hom}(\iota, \iota \circ (\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}})), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, Z_{\lambda, \mu}.$$

Note that then any $r \in R$ has a unique expansion in the $\Psi_{\lambda, \mu; i}$'s with coefficients in Q [63, 52]. In the sequel we will freely identify N canonically with $N \otimes \mathbf{1}$ and similarly N^{opp} with $\mathbf{1} \otimes N^{\text{opp}}$.

Proposition 2.1 *There are irreducible subfactors $N \subset M_{\pm}$ such that their dual canonical endomorphisms $\theta_{\pm}$ are decomposed as $[\theta_+] = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} Z_{\lambda,0}[\lambda]$. and $[\theta_-] = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} Z_{0,\lambda}[\lambda]$, respectively.*

Proof. Put $\hat{N} = N \otimes \mathbf{1} \subset R$ and define

$$\hat{M}_+ = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{\lambda,0}} \hat{N} \Psi_{\lambda,\mu;i}.$$

We first claim that $\hat{N} \subset \hat{M}_+$ is an irreducible subfactor, i.e. $\hat{N}' \cap \hat{M}_+ = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$ (in particular $\hat{M}_+$ is a factor). Let $X \in \hat{N}' \cap \hat{M}_+$ and expand $X = \sum_{\lambda,i} (n_{\lambda,i} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \Psi_{\lambda,0;i}$, with $n_{\lambda,i} \in N$. Since the $\Psi_{\lambda,\mu;i}$'s are linearly independent over Q we obtain from $X \in \hat{N}'$ for all $n \in N$

$$(n \otimes \mathbf{1})(n_{\lambda,i} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \Psi_{\lambda,0;i} = (n_{\lambda,i} \otimes \mathbf{1}) \Psi_{\lambda,0;i} (n \otimes \mathbf{1}) = (n_{\lambda,i} \otimes \mathbf{1})(\lambda(n) \otimes \mathbf{1}) \Psi_{\lambda,0;i}$$

for all $\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, Z_{\lambda,0}$ individually, where we also used the intertwining property of $\Psi_{\lambda,0;i}$. We conclude $n_{\lambda,i} \in \text{Hom}(\lambda, \text{id}) = \delta_{\lambda,0} \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$, implying $\hat{N}' \cap \hat{M}_+ = \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$. Letting $\iota_+ : \hat{N} \hookrightarrow \hat{M}_+$ denote the injection homomorphism we find with a similar argument for $\lambda' \in \text{End}(N)$ that $\text{Hom}(\iota_+, \iota_+(\lambda' \otimes \text{id}))$ is zero unless $[\lambda'] = [\lambda]$ and consequently we obtain by [52] that $\theta_+ = \iota_+ \iota_+$ is decomposed as $[\theta] = \bigoplus_{\lambda} Z_{\lambda,0}[\lambda \otimes \text{id}]$. Playing a similar game with $\hat{M}_-^{\text{opp}} = \sum_{\mu,i} (\mathbf{1} \otimes N^{\text{opp}}) \Psi_{0,\mu;i}$ completes the proof. $\square$

The following identifies $\hat{M}_+$ and $\hat{M}_-^{\text{opp}}$ as relative commutants of N^{opp} and N , respectively, in R , and therefore can be considered as some kinds of “maximally extended chiral algebras” (cf. [79]).

Proposition 2.2 *We have*

$$\hat{M}_+ = (\mathbf{1} \otimes N^{\text{opp}})' \cap R, \quad \hat{M}_-^{\text{opp}} = (N \otimes \mathbf{1})' \cap R. \quad (13)$$

Proof. We only show the first equality, the second one is proven similarly. Any $X \in R$ can be expanded as

$$X = \sum_{\lambda,\mu,i \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \sum_{i=1}^{Z_{\lambda,\mu}} (n_{\lambda,\mu;i}^1 \otimes n_{\lambda,\mu;i}^2) \Psi_{\lambda,\mu;i}$$

with $n_{\lambda,\mu;i}^1 \in N$, $n_{\lambda,\mu;i}^2 \in N^{\text{opp}}$. Then $X \in (\mathbf{1} \otimes N^{\text{opp}})'$ implies that $n_{\lambda,\mu;i}^2 \in \text{Hom}(\mu^{\text{opp}}, \text{id}^{\text{opp}}) = \delta_{\mu,0} \mathbb{C}\mathbf{1}$, so that $X \in \hat{M}_+$. Consequently, $(\mathbf{1} \otimes N^{\text{opp}})' \cap R \subset \hat{M}_+$. The opposite inclusion is obvious. $\square$

From now on we assume that the system ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ is braided and denote

$$\hat{\varepsilon}^\pm(\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}}, \rho \otimes \nu^{\text{opp}})^* = \varepsilon^\pm(\lambda, \rho) \otimes j(\varepsilon^\pm(\mu, \nu)).$$

(Here $j : N \rightarrow N^{\text{opp}}$ denotes the anti-linear isomorphism.) This gives a braiding on ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N \otimes {}_N\mathcal{X}_N^{\text{opp}}$ and can be extended to sums and products in the usual way (see e.g. [13, Subsect. 2.2]).

Proposition 2.3 *If the locality condition holds, $\hat{\varepsilon}^\pm(\Theta, \Theta)V^2 = V^2$ for Longo's isometry $V \in \text{Hom}(\text{id}, \Gamma)$, $\Gamma = \bar{\iota}$, then $\hat{M}_+$ and $\hat{M}_-^{\text{opp}}$ commute.*

Proof. The locality condition is equivalent to having [63]

$$\hat{\varepsilon}^\pm(\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}}, \rho \otimes \nu^{\text{opp}})\Psi_{\lambda, \mu; i}\Psi_{\rho, \nu; j} = \Psi_{\rho, \nu; j}\Psi_{\lambda, \mu; i}. \quad (14)$$

Consequently $\Psi_{\lambda, 0; i}$ and $\Psi_{0, \mu; j}$ commute for all λ, μ, i, j , and hence so do $\hat{M}_+$ and $\hat{M}_-^{\text{opp}}$. $\square$

2.2 On Δ -induction

Here we show that the entire R - R system can be obtained by some induction procedure similar to α -induction.

We now define an extension of $\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}} \in \text{End}(Q)$ to R in the spirit of α -induction [63, 7] and call it Δ -induction: We put $\Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^\pm|_Q = \lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}}$ and

$$\Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^\pm(\Psi_{\rho, \nu; i}) = \hat{\varepsilon}^\pm(\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}}, \rho \otimes \nu^{\text{opp}})^*\Psi_{\rho, \nu; i}.$$

We also assume “locality”, i.e. $\hat{\varepsilon}^\pm(\Theta, \Theta)V^2 = V^2$. By the same arguments as for α -induction, this implies

$$\text{Hom}(\Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^\pm, \Delta_{\rho, \nu}^\pm) = \text{Hom}(\iota \circ (\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}}), \iota \circ (\rho \otimes \nu^{\text{opp}}))$$

since Eq. (14) implies the opposite inclusion of the obvious one obtained from the extension property of Δ -induction. In particular $\langle \text{id}, \Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^\pm \rangle = Z_{\lambda, \mu}$. If we have a subfactor $N \subset M$ allowing for α -induction then we thus find $\langle \Delta_{\lambda, \text{id}}^\pm, \Delta_{\text{id}, \mu}^\pm \rangle = \langle \alpha_\lambda^+, \alpha_\mu^- \rangle$. Therefore we expect $\Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^+$ and $\Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^-$ to produce systems isomorphic to ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M$. We will show soon that the two sector systems obtained from Δ^+ - and Δ^- -induction only intersect on the identity sector.

Let ${}_R\mathcal{X}_R$ denote a system of R - R morphisms, i.e. a choice of representative morphisms of irreducible subsectors of some $[\iota_{\text{LR}}(\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}})\bar{\iota}_{\text{LR}}]$ (and containing the identity morphism). Let ${}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\pm \subset {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta \subset {}_R\mathcal{X}_R$ denote the subsystems arising from chiral inductions $\Delta^\pm$ and the mixed induction (with notation analogous to [13, 14, 10, 15]).

Lemma 2.4 *Provided that the braiding on ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$ is non-degenerate, we have*

$$\langle \Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^+, \Delta_{\rho, \nu}^- \rangle = \langle \Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^+, \text{id} \rangle \langle \text{id}, \Delta_{\rho, \nu}^- \rangle. \quad (15)$$

In other words, writing $\Xi_{\lambda, \mu; \rho, \nu} = \langle \Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^+, \Delta_{\rho, \nu}^- \rangle$ then gives $\Xi_{\lambda, \mu; \rho, \nu} = Z_{\lambda, \mu}Z_{\rho, \nu}$.

Proof. We define a matrix

$$R_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu;\Omega}^{\Omega'} = \langle \Omega \Delta_{\lambda,\mu}^+ \Delta_{\rho,\nu}^-, \Omega' \rangle$$

for $\Omega, \Omega' \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta$. Since we assume non-degeneracy of the braiding, the characters of the N - N will be exhausted by the statistics characters. Thanks to the homomorphism property of Δ -induction with respect to both entries, we obtain by the usual arguments

$$R_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu;\Omega}^{\Omega'} = \sum_{i=1}^{\#_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} \frac{S_{\lambda,\Phi_1^+(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^+(i)}} \frac{S_{\mu,\Phi_2^+(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^+(i)}} \frac{S_{\rho,\Phi_1^-(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^-(i)}} \frac{S_{\nu,\Phi_2^-(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^-(i)}} \xi_\Omega^i (\xi_{\Omega'}^i)^*$$

with maps $\Phi_j^\pm : \{1, 2, \dots, \#_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta\} \rightarrow {}_N\mathcal{X}_N$, and where the ξ^i 's are orthonormal vectors (cf. [8, p. 92] or [9, p. 203]). Note that the statistical dimension of $\lambda \otimes \mu^{\text{opp}}$ is given by $\omega_\lambda/\omega_\mu$. By the same arguments as for α -induction (cf. [9, Lemma 3.10]) we find

$$\Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} = \frac{\omega_\lambda \omega_\nu}{\omega_\mu \omega_\rho} \Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu}.$$

Note that $\Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} = R_{\lambda,\mu;\bar{\rho},\bar{\nu};0}^0$. Hence we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda,\mu,\rho,\nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} S_{0,\lambda} S_{0,\mu} \Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} S_{\rho,0} S_{\nu,0} &= \sum_{\lambda,\mu,\rho,\nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} S_{0,\lambda} S_{0,\mu} \omega_\lambda \omega_\mu^* \Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} \omega_\rho^* \omega_\nu S_{\rho,0} S_{\nu,0} \\ &= \sum_{\lambda,\mu,\rho,\nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \sum_{i=1}^{\#_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} S_{0,\lambda} S_{0,\mu} \omega_\lambda \omega_\mu^* \frac{S_{\lambda,\Phi_1^+(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^+(i)}} \frac{S_{\mu,\Phi_2^+(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^+(i)}} \frac{S_{\bar{\rho},\Phi_1^-(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^-(i)}} \frac{S_{\bar{\nu},\Phi_2^-(i)}}{S_{0,\Phi_1^-(i)}} |\xi_0^i|^2 \omega_\rho^* \omega_\nu S_{\rho,0} S_{\nu,0} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\#_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} \omega_{\Phi_1^+(i)} \omega_{\Phi_2^+(i)}^* \omega_{\Phi_1^-(i)}^* \omega_{\Phi_2^-(i)} |\xi_0^i|^2 \leq \|\xi_0\|^2 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

where we used the modular relation $STS = T^*ST^*$. On the other hand we clearly have $\langle \Delta_{\lambda,\mu}^+, \Delta_{\rho,\nu}^- \rangle \geq \langle \Delta_{\lambda,\mu}^+, \text{id} \rangle \langle \text{id}, \Delta_{\rho,\nu}^- \rangle$, i.e. $\Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} \geq Z_{\lambda,\mu} Z_{\rho,\nu}$. Hence

$$\sum_{\lambda,\mu,\rho,\nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} S_{0,\lambda} S_{0,\mu} \Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} S_{\rho,0} S_{\nu,0} \geq \sum_{\lambda,\mu,\rho,\nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} S_{0,\lambda} S_{0,\mu} Z_{\lambda,\mu} Z_{\rho,\nu} S_{\rho,0} S_{\nu,0} = 1$$

by modular invariance. Therefore we conclude that $\Xi_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} = Z_{\lambda,\mu} Z_{\rho,\nu}$. $\square$

Next we define a vector $\vec{v}$ by putting

$$v_\Omega = \sum_{\lambda,\mu,\rho,\nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} d_\lambda d_\mu d_\rho d_\nu \langle \Omega, \Delta_{\lambda,\mu}^+ \Delta_{\rho,\nu}^- \rangle, \quad \Omega \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta.$$

By an analogous calculation as in the proof of [10, Prop. 3.1] we find $R_{\lambda,\mu;\rho,\nu} \vec{v} = d_\lambda d_\mu d_\rho d_\nu \vec{v}$ so that $\vec{v}$ is a scalar multiple of the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector $\vec{d}$ (with

entries d_Ω), i.e. $\vec{v} = \zeta \vec{d}$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$. By $d_0 = 1$ we notice $\zeta = v_0$ which can be calculated as

$$v_0 = \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \rho, \nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} d_\lambda d_\mu d_\rho d_\nu \langle \text{id}, \Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^+ \Delta_{\rho, \nu}^- \rangle = \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \rho, \nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} d_\lambda Z_{\lambda, \mu} d_\mu d_\rho Z_{\rho, \nu} d_\nu = w^2$$

by Lemma 2.4. (As usual, $w = \sum_\lambda d_\lambda^2$ denotes the global index of ${}_N\mathcal{X}_N$.) Thus $v_\Omega = w^2 d_\Omega$ for all $\Omega \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta$. On the other hand we know

$$d_\lambda d_\mu d_\rho d_\nu = \sum_{\Omega \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} \langle \Omega, \Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^+ \Delta_{\rho, \nu}^- \rangle d_\Omega$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} w^4 &= \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \rho, \nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} d_\lambda^2 d_\mu^2 d_\rho^2 d_\nu^2 = \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \rho, \nu \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \sum_{\Omega \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} d_\lambda d_\mu d_\rho d_\nu \langle \Omega, \Delta_{\lambda, \mu}^+ \Delta_{\rho, \nu}^- \rangle d_\Omega \\ &= \sum_{\Omega \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} v_\Omega d_\Omega = w^2 \sum_{\Omega \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} d_\Omega^2 = w^2 w_\Delta \end{aligned}$$

with $w_\Delta = \sum_{\Omega \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta} d_\Omega^2$. Thus we have obtained

Corollary 2.5 *We have $w_\Delta = w^2$, and consequently each R - R sector is realized by Δ -induction, i.e. ${}_R\mathcal{X}_R = {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\Delta$.*

Let $\Omega_\pm \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\pm$. Note that then the product $\Omega_+ \Omega_-$ is irreducible as

$$\langle \Omega_+ \Omega_-, \Omega_+ \Omega_- \rangle = \langle \Omega_+ \overline{\Omega}_+, \Omega_- \overline{\Omega}_- \rangle = 1$$

since ${}_R\mathcal{X}_R^+ \cap {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^- = \{\text{id}\}$ by Lemma 2.4. Hence we have obtained

Corollary 2.6 *The system of R - R morphisms is exhausted by the products $\Omega_+ \Omega_-$ with $\Omega_\pm \in {}_R\mathcal{X}_R^\pm$.*

3 Finite groups and the McKay correspondence

3.1 Background

The quantum doubles of finite groups provide modular data whose modular invariants can be precisely analysed [18, 30]. Finite groups are also of course significant for modular invariants, particularly $SU(2)$ modular invariants, by the ADE classification of finite subgroups of $SU(2)$. If G is a finite subgroup of $SU(2)$, then the McKay graph of $\hat{G}$ is an affine ADE graph. It is a challenge to relate the ADE classification of modular invariants and corresponding subfactor theory with the classification of the ADE finite subgroups and the corresponding theory of the resolution of quotient singularities. Here are some modest contributions in this direction. See also announcements of [67, 69].

3.2 Kostant's result

As is well-known, the McKay correspondence associates the finite subgroups of $SU(2)$ with affine Dynkin diagrams. Using ordinary Coxeter graphs, the correspondence is as in Table 1. Now pick one of these finite subgroups $G \subset SU(2)$. For $\gamma \in \hat{G}$ (the

Table 1: The McKay correspondence

Dynkin diagram	Subgroup $G \subset SU(2)$	Order of G
A_ℓ	$\mathbb{Z}_{\ell+1}$	$\ell + 1$
D_ℓ	$BD_\ell = Q_{\ell-2}$	$4\ell - 8$
E_6	$BT = BA_4$	24
E_7	$BO = BS_4$	48
E_8	$BI = BA_5$	120

group dual) we define power series

$$f_\gamma(q) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} n_j^\gamma q^j,$$

where the numbers n_j^γ is the multiplicity of γ in the restricted $(j+1)$ -dimensional representation D_j of $SU(2)$, i.e. $n_j^\gamma = \langle \text{res}_G^{SU(2)}(D_j), \gamma \rangle$. (Note that $n_j^\gamma \leq j+1$ so that f_γ converges e.g. inside the unit disc of $\mathbb{C}$.) It was proven by Kostant [59] that

$$f_\gamma(q) = \frac{p_\gamma(q)}{(1-q^r)(1-q^s)}$$

with r and s positive integers such that $r+s = h+2$ and $rs = \#G$ where h is the dual Coxeter number of the Dynkin diagram associated to the group G (with order $\#G$), and the important thing is now that $p_\gamma(q)$ is a polynomial. Labelling the trivial representation in $\hat{G}$ by “*” then we have $p_*(q) = 1 + q^h$ and for the other representations we have

$$p_\gamma(q) = \sum_{i=0}^{h-2} c_i^\gamma q^{i+1},$$

with positive integers c_i^γ . But let us now recall that the affine Dynkin diagram $\hat{\Gamma}$ associated to G has adjacency matrix

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\gamma, \gamma'} = \langle \gamma', \gamma \otimes \gamma_1 \rangle, \quad \gamma, \gamma' \in \hat{G},$$

and where $\gamma_1 = \text{res}_G^{SU(2)}(D_1)$. Recall the tensor product rules $D_j \otimes D_1 = D_{j+1} \oplus D_{j-1}$ for $j \geq 1$ and certainly $D_0 \otimes D_1 = D_1$. Thus we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\gamma' \in \hat{G}} \hat{\Gamma}_{\gamma, \gamma'} f_{\gamma'}(q) &= \sum_{\gamma' \in \hat{G}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \langle \text{res}_G^{SU(2)}(D_j), \gamma' \rangle \langle \gamma', \gamma \otimes \gamma_1 \rangle q^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \langle \text{res}_G^{SU(2)}(D_j), \gamma \otimes \gamma_1 \rangle q^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \langle \text{res}_G^{SU(2)}(D_1 \otimes D_j), \gamma \rangle q^j \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} n_{j+1}^{\gamma} q^j + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} n_{j-1}^{\gamma} q^j \\ &= q^{-1}(f_{\gamma}(q) - n_0^{\gamma}) + q f_{\gamma}(q), \end{aligned}$$

so that we obtain

$$\sum_{\gamma' \in \hat{G}} \hat{\Gamma}_{\gamma, \gamma'} f_{\gamma'}(q) = (q + q^{-1})f_{\gamma}(q) - q^{-1}\delta_{\gamma,*}, \quad (16)$$

due to $n_0^{\gamma} = \delta_{\gamma,*}$, and in fact Eq. (16) determines the f_{γ} 's completely [53]. (For $SU(3)$, presumably the polynomials would have two variables, i.e. something like

$$f_{\gamma}(q_1, q_2) = \sum_{\lambda_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\lambda_2=0}^{\infty} n_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\gamma} q_1^{\lambda_1} q_2^{\lambda_2}$$

with $n_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}^{\gamma} = \langle \text{res}_G^{SU(3)}(D_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}), \gamma \rangle$ for $G \subset SU(3)$, $\gamma \in \hat{G}$, and $D_{(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)}$ is the representation of $SU(3)$ with ‘‘Dynkin labels’’ $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$

3.3 Relating Kostant’s result to subfactors

Now let us turn to our subfactors realizing the ADE modular invariants. Recall that for an ordinary ADE Dynkin diagram Γ its affine extension $\hat{\Gamma}$ is obtained by adding one vertex ‘‘*’’ and joining it by an edge to a certain vertex of Γ . By the argument of changing the ι -vertex [26] we may and do assume that our subfactor $N \subset M$ realizing the Γ modular invariant has the ι -vertex exactly on the vertex which would join the extension vertex ‘‘*’’. It turns out that we then have $\langle \theta, \lambda_k \rangle = 1$ for all the DE cases (for A we will need $=2$ and a reducible subfactor, what we do discuss here in detail). This gives a natural bijection between (equivalence classes of) non-trivial irreducible representations of G and M - N sectors. We will denote the M - N morphism associated to $\gamma \in \hat{G} \setminus \{*\}$ by $\bar{a}_{\gamma}$. Note that $\iota = \bar{a}_{\gamma_1}$. Now let us define the following polynomials labelled by $\gamma \in \hat{G}$:

$$\begin{aligned} p_*(q) &= 1 + q^{k+2}, \\ p_{\gamma}(q) &= \sum_{j=0}^k \langle \bar{a}_{\gamma}, \iota \lambda_j \rangle q^{j+1}, \\ \Omega(q) &= (1 + q^2)p_*(q) - qp_{\gamma_1}(q). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We now claim

$$\sum_{\gamma' \in \hat{G}} \hat{\Gamma}_{\gamma, \gamma'} p_{\gamma'}(q) = (q + q^{-1})p_{\gamma}(q) - q^{-1}\delta_{\gamma,*}\Omega(q),$$

Let's compute the left-hand side for the three cases: (1) $\gamma = *$, (2) $\gamma = \gamma_1$, and (3) otherwise. For (1) we clearly obtain p_{γ_1} . For (2) we obtain $p_* + \sum_{\gamma'} \langle \bar{a}_\gamma \lambda_1, \bar{a}_{\gamma'} \rangle p_{\gamma'}$, and for (3) we obtain $\sum_{\gamma'} \langle \bar{a}_\gamma \lambda_1, \bar{a}_{\gamma'} \rangle p_{\gamma'}$. Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\gamma' \in \hat{G}} \langle \bar{a}_\gamma \lambda_1, \bar{a}_{\gamma'} \rangle p_{\gamma'}(q) &= \sum_{j=0}^k \langle \bar{a}_\gamma \lambda_1, \iota \lambda_j \rangle q^{j+1} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \langle \bar{a}_\gamma, \iota \lambda_{j+1} \rangle q^{j+1} + \sum_{j=1}^k \langle \bar{a}_\gamma, \iota \lambda_{j-1} \rangle q^{j+1} \\ &= (q + q^{-1}) p_\gamma(q) - \langle \bar{a}_\gamma, \iota \rangle - \langle \bar{a}_\gamma, \iota \lambda_k \rangle q^{k+2} \\ &= (q + q^{-1}) p_\gamma(q) - (1 + q^{k+2}) \delta_{\gamma, \gamma_1}, \end{aligned}$$

since $[\iota] = [\iota \lambda_k]$. Therefore the left-hand side gives $p_{\gamma_1}(q)$ for (1), i.e. $\gamma = *$, and $(q + q^{-1}) p_\gamma(q)$ for both (2) and (3), i.e. otherwise. This equals the right-hand side, so the claim is correct. We conclude that putting $P_\gamma(q) = p_\gamma(q)/\Omega(q)$ in fact solves Eq. (16), and thus we can identify $f_\gamma = P_\gamma$ and in turn $c_i^\gamma = \langle \bar{a}_\gamma, \iota \lambda_j \rangle$. Thus we have a fairly direct interpretation of the c_i^γ 's through putting the ι -vertex next to the $*$ -vertex. But note that even if we locate a different vertex, say $\bar{b}$, next to $*$, then we will similarly obtain $c_i^\gamma = \langle \bar{a}_\gamma, \bar{b} \lambda_j \rangle$. (Therefore the c_i^γ 's are found to be certain entries of our matrices G_λ . This coincidence has also been noticed by Di Francesco and Zuber [21] in their more empirical approach to these matrices.) Nevertheless the exponents in Kostant's polynomials appear most directly in the above sketched setting where p_{γ_1} "is essentially $[\theta]$ ". (Note that $[\theta] = \bigoplus_j c_j^{\gamma_1} [\lambda_j]$.)

3.4 A modular invariant from a group

We now construct modular invariant for a simple case without α -induction. Let $\Delta \subset N$ be a braided system, $\Gamma \subset \Delta$ a subsystem and let $\Theta \subset \Gamma$ be the degenerate subsystem of Γ . Thanks to Rehren [76], and the theory of Doplicher-Roberts [24], we know that Θ is a group dual, i.e. $\omega_\vartheta = \pm 1$ and $d_\vartheta \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\vartheta \in \Theta$. We assume that it is purely bosonic, i.e. that $\omega_\vartheta = +1$ for all $\vartheta \in \Theta$. Let $w_\Gamma = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} d_\gamma^2$ and put

$$\langle y^\lambda, y^\mu \rangle_\Gamma = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Y_{\lambda, \gamma}^* Y_{\mu, \gamma}.$$

Note that for $\lambda, \mu \in \Gamma$ we have

$$\langle y^\lambda, y^\mu \rangle_\Gamma = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Y_{\bar{\lambda}, \gamma} Y_{\mu, \gamma} = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} d_\gamma \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma} N_{\bar{\lambda}, \mu}^{\gamma'} Y_{\gamma, \gamma'} = \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma} N_{\bar{\lambda}, \mu}^{\gamma'} \langle y^0, y^{\gamma'} \rangle_\Gamma = w_\Gamma \sum_{\vartheta \in \Theta} N_{\bar{\lambda}, \vartheta}^\mu d_\vartheta$$

Let's now define a matrix Z with entries

$$Z_{\lambda, \mu} = \begin{cases} w_\Gamma^{-1} \langle y^\lambda, y^\mu \rangle_\Gamma & \lambda, \mu \in \Gamma, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which hence has non-negative integral entries, and also $Z_{0,0} = 1$. Since Θ is the subsystem of degenerate sectors in Γ we will have $\omega_\lambda \omega_\vartheta / \omega_\mu = 1$ whenever $N_{\bar{\lambda}, \vartheta}^\mu \neq 0$, and since it is purely bosonic we will then therefore have $\omega_\lambda = \omega_\mu$ for $\lambda, \mu \in \Gamma$. It

follows that $ZT = TZ$. To establish Y-invariance, we need another assumption. We assume that $\langle y^0, y^\mu \rangle_\Gamma = 0$ whenever $\lambda \notin \Gamma$. Note that this implies for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ that $\langle y^\lambda, y^\gamma \rangle_\Gamma = 0$ whenever $\lambda \notin \Gamma$ since then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle y^\lambda, y^\gamma \rangle_\Gamma &= \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma} Y_{\bar{\lambda}, \gamma'} Y_{\gamma, \gamma'} = \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma} d_{\gamma'} \sum_{\nu \in \Delta} N_{\bar{\lambda}, \gamma}^\nu Y_{\gamma', \nu} \\ &= \sum_{\nu \in \Delta} N_{\bar{\lambda}, \gamma}^\nu \langle y^0, y^\nu \rangle_\Gamma = \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma} N_{\bar{\lambda}, \gamma}^{\gamma'} \langle y^0, y^{\gamma'} \rangle_\Gamma = 0 \end{aligned}$$

since then $N_{\bar{\lambda}, \gamma}^{\gamma'} = 0$. Now Y-invariance can be easily seen: Writing Y and Z as 2×2 blocks according to labels in Γ and not in $\Delta \setminus \Gamma$ we need to check that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Y_{\lambda, \gamma} Z_{\gamma, \mu} = \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Z_{\lambda, \gamma} Y_{\gamma, \mu}$$

for $\lambda, \mu \in \Gamma$, and that

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Y_{\lambda, \gamma} Z_{\gamma, \mu} = 0$$

whenever $\lambda \notin \Gamma, \mu \in \Gamma$. Using our assumption, both is now obvious if we write

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Y_{\lambda, \gamma} Z_{\gamma, \mu} = w_\Gamma^{-1} \sum_{\gamma, \rho \in \Gamma} Y_{\lambda, \gamma} Y_{\gamma, \rho}^* Y_{\rho, \mu} = w_\Gamma^{-1} \sum_{\rho \in \Gamma} \langle y^\lambda, y^\rho \rangle_\Gamma Y_{\rho, \mu}$$

for $\mu \in \Gamma$.

4 How to prove $YZ = ZY$ without the double triangle algebra

Here we show how one can prove Y-invariance of the coupling matrix (Ω -invariance is established in [10, Lemma 6.1]) without reference to the double triangle algebra (DTA). However, we can only complete the argument covering the non-degenerate case and the case of Z being a permutation.

We have the nimrep $\{\Gamma_\lambda : \lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N\}$ of multiplication by $\alpha_\lambda^\pm$ on ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$. Taking quantum dimension, since $d_\lambda = d_{\alpha_\lambda}$, we must have that $N_\lambda[d_\beta]_\beta = d_\lambda[d_\beta]_\beta$, using our basis β of ${}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$. On the other hand, $N_\lambda\alpha_\mu^\pm = \alpha_{\lambda\mu}^\pm$, and again we should get a vector $[d_\mu]$ with eigenvalue d_λ . To relate this to the basis $[\beta]$, we just proceed as in the Subsection 2.2

First we recall from the proof of [14, Prop. 3.1] that by defining vectors $\vec{v}^\pm$ with components labelled by $\beta \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$,

$$v_\beta^\pm = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} d_\lambda \langle \beta, \alpha_\lambda^\pm \rangle, \quad \beta \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm,$$

a simple Perron-Frobenius argument shows that the vectors $\vec{v}^\pm$ are proportional to the dimension vectors $\vec{d}^\pm$ (with entries d_β), and since $d_\lambda = \sum_\beta \langle \beta, \alpha_\lambda^\pm \rangle d_\beta$ we find by

summing $\sum_{\beta} d_{\beta} v_{\beta}^{\pm}$ that $\vec{v}^{\pm} = \vec{d}^{\pm} w / w_{\pm}$. Comparing the 0-entries yields then

$$\frac{w}{w_{+}} = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N \mathcal{X}_N} d_{\lambda} Z_{\lambda,0}, \quad \frac{w}{w_{-}} = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N \mathcal{X}_N} Z_{0,\lambda} d_{\lambda}.$$

It is obvious that commutativity $[Y, Z] = 0$ (which was proven in [13, Thm. 5.7] using DTA methods) now implies $w_{+} = w_{-}$, but this is what we want to avoid here since the aim is now to prove $[Y, Z] = 0$ independently.

By a similar Perron-Frobenius argument, it was shown in the proof of [10, Prop. 3.1] that the vector $\vec{v}$ with entries

$$v_{\beta} = \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in {}_N \mathcal{X}_N} d_{\lambda} d_{\mu} \langle \beta, \alpha_{\lambda}^{+} \alpha_{\mu}^{-} \rangle, \quad \beta \in {}_M \mathcal{X}_M^{\alpha},$$

is proportional to the vector $\vec{d}$, now with entries d_{β} labelled by $\beta \in {}_M \mathcal{X}_M^{\alpha}$, and one finds that $\vec{v} = \vec{d} w^2 / w_{\alpha}$. Checking the 0-entries one thus obtains

$$\frac{w^2}{w_{\alpha}} = \sum_{\lambda, \mu \in {}_N \mathcal{X}_N} d_{\lambda} Z_{\lambda, \mu} d_{\mu}.$$

(Extending the vectors $\vec{v}^{\pm}$ to ${}_M \mathcal{X}_M^{\alpha}$ by entries = 0 and computing $\langle \vec{v}^{+}, \vec{v}^{-} \rangle$ also yields $w_{\alpha} w_0 = w_{+} w_{-}$.) Now as in the proof of [10, Lemma 6.2] we define two further vectors $\vec{u}^{\pm}$ with entries

$$u_{\beta}^{\pm} = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N \mathcal{X}_N} \omega_{\lambda} d_{\lambda} \langle \beta, \alpha_{\lambda}^{\pm} \rangle, \quad \beta \in {}_M \mathcal{X}_M^{\alpha}.$$

(Or labelled by ${}_M \mathcal{X}_M$, it does not matter.) We now want to establish a very important identity, namely

$$u_{\beta}^{\pm} = \begin{cases} \omega_{\tau} d_{\tau} w / w_{\pm} & : \quad \beta = \tau \in {}_M \mathcal{X}_M^0 \\ 0 & : \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

To prove this, we first compute

$$\begin{aligned} \|\vec{u}^{+}\|^2 &= \sum_{\beta} \sum_{\lambda, \nu} \omega_{\lambda} \omega_{\nu}^{-1} d_{\lambda} d_{\nu} \langle \alpha_{\nu}^{+}, \beta \rangle \langle \beta, \alpha_{\lambda}^{+} \rangle = \sum_{\lambda, \nu} \omega_{\lambda} \omega_{\nu}^{-1} d_{\lambda} d_{\nu} \langle \alpha_{\lambda}^{+} \alpha_{\nu}^{+}, \text{id} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \nu} \omega_{\lambda} \omega_{\nu}^{-1} d_{\lambda} d_{\nu} N_{\lambda, \nu}^{\mu} \langle \alpha_{\mu}^{+}, \text{id} \rangle = \sum_{\lambda, \mu, \nu} \omega_{\lambda} \omega_{\nu}^{-1} d_{\lambda} d_{\nu} N_{\lambda, \mu}^{\nu} \omega_{\mu} Z_{\mu, 0} \\ &= \sum_{\lambda, \mu} Y_{0, \lambda} Y_{\lambda, \mu} Z_{\mu, 0}, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $Z_{\mu, 0} = \omega_{\mu} Z_{\mu, 0}$ by [10, Lemma 6.1]. Similarly we obtain $\|\vec{u}^{-}\|^2 = \sum_{\lambda, \mu} Y_{0, \lambda} Y_{\lambda, \mu} Z_{0, \mu}$. Now by Rehren's argument [76] we have

$$\sum_{\mu \in {}_N \mathcal{X}_N} Y_{\lambda, \mu} Y_{\mu, 0} = \begin{cases} w d_{\lambda} & \lambda \in {}_N \mathcal{X}_N^{\text{deg}} \\ 0 & \lambda \notin {}_N \mathcal{X}_N^{\text{deg}} \end{cases}.$$

Since clearly $Z_{\lambda,0} = Z_{0,\lambda}$ as $\alpha_\lambda^+ = \alpha_\lambda^-$ for $\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N^{\text{deg}}$, we obtain

$$\|\vec{u}^+\|^2 = \|\vec{u}^-\|^2 = w \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N^{\text{deg}}} d_\lambda Z_{\lambda,0}. \quad (19)$$

On the other hand, we can compute the inner product

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \vec{u}^+, \vec{u}^- \rangle &= \sum_{\lambda,\mu} \sum_{\beta} \omega_\lambda^{-1} d_\lambda d_\mu \omega_\mu \langle \alpha_\lambda^+, \beta \rangle \langle \beta, \alpha_\mu^- \rangle = \sum_{\lambda,\mu} \omega_\lambda^{-1} d_\lambda d_\mu \omega_\mu Z_{\lambda,\mu} \\ &= \sum_{\lambda,\mu} d_\lambda Z_{\lambda,\mu} d_\mu = \frac{w^2}{w_\alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Now let us consider the case that the braiding is non-degenerate or that Z is a permutation matrix (i.e. $Z_{\lambda,0} = \delta_{\lambda,0}$). Then Eq. (19) yields $\|\vec{u}^+\|^2 = \|\vec{u}^-\|^2 = w$ whereas Eq. (20) yields for the inner product $\langle \vec{u}^+, \vec{u}^- \rangle = w^2/w_\alpha \geq w$ (since always $w_\alpha \leq w$), so that we can conclude $\vec{u}^+ = \vec{u}^-$. Since obviously $u_\beta^\pm = 0$ whenever $\beta \notin {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm$ this implies $u_\beta^\pm = 0$ whenever $\beta \notin {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0$. Now for $\beta = \tau \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0$ we find by [10, Lemma 6.1] and the above derived $\vec{v}^\pm = \vec{d}^\pm w/w_\pm$

$$u_\tau^\pm = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \omega_\lambda d_\lambda \langle \tau, \alpha_\lambda^\pm \rangle = \omega_\tau \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} d_\lambda \langle \tau, \alpha_\lambda^\pm \rangle = \frac{w}{w_\pm} d_\tau \omega_\tau,$$

proving Eq. (18). So what is so fascinating about Eq. (18)? The point is, that it fully equivalent to $[Y, Z] = 0$. In fact, using $[Y, Z]$ we proved $\vec{u}^+ = \vec{u}^-$ and thus Eq. (18) in [10, Lemma 6.2]. Conversely, Eq. (18) can be used, as in the proof of [10, Lemma 6.3], to compute

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} b_{\tau,\lambda}^\pm Y_{\lambda,\mu} &= \sum_{\lambda,\rho \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \frac{\omega_\lambda \omega_\mu}{\omega_\rho} N_{\lambda,\mu}^\rho d_\rho b_{\tau,\lambda}^\pm \\ &= \sum_{\lambda,\rho \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \frac{\omega_\tau \omega_\mu}{\omega_\rho} N_{\rho,\mu}^\lambda d_\rho \langle \alpha_\lambda^\pm, \tau \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\rho \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \frac{\omega_\tau \omega_\mu}{\omega_\rho} d_\rho \langle \alpha_\rho^\pm, \tau \alpha_\mu^\pm \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\rho \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \sum_{\beta \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^\pm} \frac{\omega_\tau \omega_\mu}{\omega_\rho} d_\rho \langle \alpha_\rho^\pm, \beta \rangle \langle \beta, \tau \alpha_\mu^\pm \rangle \\ &= \frac{w}{w_\pm} \sum_{\tau'' \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0} \frac{\omega_\tau \omega_\mu}{\omega_{\tau''}} d_{\tau''} \langle \tau'', \tau \alpha_\mu^\pm \rangle \\ &= \frac{w}{w_\pm} \sum_{\tau', \tau'' \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0} \frac{\omega_\tau \omega_\mu}{\omega_{\tau''}} N_{\tau,\tau''}^{\tau'} d_{\tau''} \langle \tau', \alpha_\mu^\pm \rangle \\ &= \frac{w}{w_\pm} \sum_{\tau', \tau'' \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0} \frac{\omega_\tau \omega_{\tau'}}{\omega_{\tau''}} N_{\tau,\tau'}^{\tau''} d_{\tau''} b_{\tau',\mu}^\pm \\ &= \frac{w}{w_\pm} \sum_{\tau' \in {}_M\mathcal{X}_M^0} Y_{\tau,\tau'}^{\text{ext}} b_{\tau',\mu}^\pm, \end{aligned}$$

where we actually used (the complex conjugate of) Eq. (18) in the fifth equality. Here we were however a little more careful than in the proof of [10, Lemma 6.3] as we here distinguished w_+ and w_- because we would not know about their equality without using [13, Thm. 5.7]. Writing the chiral branching coefficients as rectangular matrices, we have now obtained $wY^{\text{ext}}b^\pm = w_\pm b^\pm Y$. With $Z = {}^t b^+ b^-$ this yields

$$w_- ZY = w_- {}^t b^+ b^- Y = w {}^t b^+ Y^{\text{ext}} b^- = w_+ Y {}^t b^+ b^- = w_+ YZ.$$

Since $Z_{\lambda,0} = Z_{0,\lambda}$ for $\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N^{\text{deg}}$, we obtain in particular

$$\frac{w_+}{w_-}(YZY)_{0,0} = (ZY^2)_{0,0} = \sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N^{\text{deg}}} Z_{0,\lambda} d_\lambda = (Y^2 Z)_{0,0} = \frac{w_-}{w_+}(YZY)_{0,0}.$$

Now $(YZY)_{0,0} \geq Z_{0,0} = 1$, hence $w_+ = w_-$ so that we finally obtain $YZ = ZY$ indeed.

To summarize, we have shown that the following are equivalent:

- $[Y, Z] = 0$,
- $\sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N^{\text{deg}}} d_\lambda Z_{\lambda,0} \leq w/w_\alpha$, and
- $\sum_{\lambda \in {}_N\mathcal{X}_N} \omega_\lambda d_\lambda \langle \beta, \alpha_\lambda^\pm \rangle = 0$ unless β is ambichiral.

If $Z_{\lambda,0}$ vanishes for all degenerate λ except $\lambda = \text{id}$ (in particular if the braiding is non-degenerate), then the second condition is trivially met since clearly $1 \leq w/w_\alpha$. Unfortunately, for the general case we still need the DTA to prove the first condition (and hence all).

Acknowledgement. This work was completed during visits to the MSRI programme on Operator Algebras in 2000-2001. I am grateful for the organizers and MSRI for their invitation and financial support. I would like to thank Jens Böckenhauer for discussions on this work as well as for our collaboration in 1996-2000 and Karl-Henning Rehren for his comments on a preliminary version of this manuscript.

References

- [1] Andrews, G. E., Baxter, R. J., and Forrester, P. J.: *Eight vertex SOS model and generalized Rogers-Ramanujan type identities*. J. Stat. Phys. **35**, (1984) 193-266
- [2] Baumgärtel, H.: *Operatoralgebraic methods in quantum field theory*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995
- [3] Behrend, R.E., Pearce, P.A., Petkova, V.B., Zuber, J.-B.: *Boundary conditions in rational conformal field theories*. Nucl. Phys. **B570** (2000), 525-589
- [4] Böckenhauer, J.: *Localized endomorphisms of the chiral Ising model*. Commun. Math. Phys. **177** (1996), 265-304
- [5] Böckenhauer, J.: *An algebraic formulation of level one Wess-Zumino-Witten models*. Rev. Math. Phys. **8** (1996), 925-947

- [6] Böckenhauer, J.: *Lecture at Warwick Workshop on Modular Invariants, Operator Algebras and Quotient Singularities*. September 1999.
- [7] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E.: *Modular invariants, graphs and α -induction for nets of subfactors. I*. Commun. Math. Phys. **197** (1998), 361-386
- [8] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E.: *Modular invariants, graphs and α -induction for nets of subfactors. II*. Commun. Math. Phys. **200** (1999), 57-103
- [9] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E.: *Modular invariants, graphs and α -induction for nets of subfactors. III*. Commun. Math. Phys. **205** (1999), 183-228
- [10] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E.: *Modular invariants from subfactors: Type I coupling matrices and intermediate subfactors*. Commun. Math. Phys. **213**, (2000) 267-289
- [11] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E.: *Modular invariants from subfactors*. Quantum Symmetries in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, editors R.Coquereaux et al. Contemporary Mathematics, AMS to appear
- [12] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E.: *Modular invariants and subfactors*. Mathematical Physics in Mathematics and Physics. editor R. Longo. Fields Institute Communications **30**, 11-37 (2001)
- [13] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E., Kawahigashi, Y.: *On α -induction, chiral generators and modular invariants for subfactors*. Commun. Math. Phys. **208** (1999), 429-487
- [14] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E., Kawahigashi, Y.: *Chiral structure of modular invariants for subfactors*. Commun. Math. Phys. **210** (2000), 733-784
- [15] Böckenhauer, J., Evans, D.E., Kawahigashi, Y.: *Longo-Rehren subfactors arising from α -induction*. Publ RIMS Kyoto **37** (2001), 1-35
- [16] Buchholz, D., Mack, G., Todorov, I. *The Current Algebra on the Circle as a Germ of Local Field Theories*. Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.)**5B** (1988), 20-56
- [17] Cappelli, A., Itzykson, C., Zuber, J.-B.: *The A-D-E classification of minimal and $A_1^{(1)}$ conformal invariant theories*. Commun. Math. Phys. **113** (1987), 1-26
- [18] Coste, C., Gannon, T., Ruelle, P., *Finite group modular data*. Nuclear Physics B **581** (2000) 679-717
- [19] Date, E., Jimbo, M., Miwa, T., Okado, M.: *Solvable lattice models*. In: *Theta functions – Bowdoin 1987, Part 1*. Proc. Symp. Pure Math. **49**, Providence, R.I.: American Math. Soc., pp. 295-332 (1987)
- [20] Degiovanni, P.: *Z/NZ Conformal field theories*. Commun. Math. Phys. **127** (1990), 71-99
- [21] Di Francesco, P.: *Integrable lattice models, graphs and modular invariant conformal field theories*. Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A7** (1992), 407-500
- [22] Di Francesco, P., Zuber, J.-B.: *$SU(N)$ lattice integrable models associated with graphs*. Nucl. Phys. **B338** (1990), 602-646
- [23] Dijkgraaf, R., Verlinde, E.: *Modular invariance and the fusion algebras*. Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.) **5B** (1988), 87-97
- [24] Doplicher, S.: *Abstract compact group duals, operator algebras and quantum field theory*. Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. I, II (Kyoto, 1990), 1319-1333, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 1991.
- [25] Evans, D.E.: *Lecture at Nordfjordeid, 1998*.
- [26] Evans, D.E.: *Fusion rules of modular invariants*. in preparation
- [27] Evans, D.E., Kawahigashi, Y.: *Orbifold subfactors from Hecke algebras*. Commun. Math. Phys. **165** (1994), 445-484
- [28] Evans, D.E., Kawahigashi, Y.: *The E_7 commuting squares produce D_{10} as principal graph*. Publ RIMS Kyoto **30** (1994), 151-166

- [29] Evans, D.E., Kawahigashi, Y.: *Quantum symmetries on operator algebras*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998
- [30] Evans, D.E., Pinto, P.R.: *Subfactor realisation of modular invariants*. in preparation
- [31] Fredenhagen, K., Rehren, K.-H., Schroer, B.: *Superselection sectors with braid group statistics and exchange algebras. II*. Rev. Math. Phys. **Special issue** (1992), 113-157
- [32] Fröhlich, J., Gabbiani, F.: *Braid statistics in local quantum theory*. Rev. Math. Phys. **2** (1990), 251-353
- [33] Fröhlich, J., Gabbiani, F.: *Operator algebras and conformal field theory*. Commun. Math. Phys. **155** (1993), 569-640
- [34] Fuchs, J.: *Affine Lie algebras and quantum groups*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992
- [35] Fuchs, J., Schellekens, A.N., Schweigert, C.: *Galois modular invariants of WZW models*. Nucl. Phys. **B437** (1995), 667-694
- [36] Fuchs, J., Schweigert, C.: *Solitonic sectors, α induction and symmetry breaking boundaries*. Physics Letters B **490** (2000), 163-172
- [37] Fuchs, J., Schweigert, C.: *Solitonic sectors, conformal boundary conditions and three dimensional topological field theory*. hep-th/0009111
- [38] Fuchs, J., Schweigert, C.: *Category theory for conformal boundary conditions* math.CT/0106050
- [39] Gaberdiel, M., Gannon, T.: *Boundary states for WZW models*. hep-th/0202067
- [40] Gannon, T.: *WZW commutants, lattices and level-one partition functions*. Nucl. Phys. **B396** (1993), 708-736
- [41] Gannon, T.: *The classification of affine $SU(3)$ modular invariants*. Commun. Math. Phys. **161** (1994), 233-264
- [42] Gannon, T.: *The level two and three modular invariants of $SU(n)$* . Lett. Math. Phys. **39** (1997), 289-298
- [43] Gannon, T.: *The Cappelli-Itzykson-Zuber A-D-E classification*. Reviews in Math Physics **12** (2000) 739-748
- [44] Gannon, T.: *The level 2 and 3 modular invariants for the orthogonal algebras*. Canadian J. Math. **30** (2000), 503-521
- [45] Gannon, T.: *Monstrous moonshine and the classification of CFT*. Lectures given in Istanbul, August 1998, math.QA/9906167
- [46] Gannon, T.: *Boundary conformal field theory and fusion ring representations* Nucl. Phys. to appear
- [47] Goodman, F., de la Harpe, P., Jones, V.F.R.: *Coxeter graphs and towers of algebras*. MSRI publications 14, Berlin: Springer, 1989
- [48] Guido, D., Longo, R.: *The conformal spin and statistics theorem*. Commun. Math. Phys. **181** (1996), 11-35
- [49] Haag, R.: *Local Quantum Physics*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1992
- [50] Izumi, M.: *Application of fusion rules to classification of subfactors*. Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **27** (1991), 953-994
- [51] Izumi, M.: *Characterization of isomorphic group-subgroup subfactors*. preprint 2002
- [52] Izumi, M., Longo, R., Popa, S.: *A Galois correspondence for compact groups of automorphisms of von Neumann algebras with a generalization to Kac algebras*. J. Funct. Anal. **155** (1998), 25-63
- [53] Itzykson, C.: *From the harmonic oscillator to the A-D-E classification of conformal models*. Adv. Stud. Pure Math. **19**, 287-346 (1989)

- [54] Jones, V.F.R.: *Index for subfactors*. Invent. Math. **72** (1983), 1-25
- [55] Kawahigashi, Y.: *On flatness of Ocneanu's connections on the Dynkin diagrams and classification of subfactors*. J. Funct. Anal. **127** (1995), 63-107
- [56] Kawahigashi, Y., Longo, R.: *Classification of local conformal nets. Case $c < 1$* . math-ph/0201015
- [57] Kodiyalam, V., Sunder, V.: *The subgroup-subfactor*. Math. Scand. **86** (2000), 45-74
- [58] Kosaki, H.: *Extension of Jones theory on Index to arbitrary factors*. J. Funct. Anal. **66** (1986), 123-140
- [59] Kostant, B.: *On finite subgroups of $SU(2)$, simple Lie algebras, and the McKay correspondence*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **81**, 5275-5277 (1984)
- [60] Kreuzer, M., Schellekens A.N.: *Simple currents versus orbifolds with discrete torsion – a complete classification*. Nucl. Phys. **B411** (1994), 97-121
- [61] Longo, R.: *Index of subfactors and statistics of quantum fields II*. Commun. Math. Phys. **130** (1990), 285-309
- [62] Longo, R.: *Minimal index of braided subfactors*. J. Funct. Anal. **109** (1991), 98-112
- [63] Longo, R., Rehren, K.-H.: *Nets of subfactors*. Rev. Math. Phys. **7** (1995), 567-597
- [64] Moore, G., Seiberg, N.: *Naturality in conformal field theory*. Nucl. Phys. **B313** (1989), 16-40
- [65] Nahm, W.: *Lie group exponents and $SU(2)$ current algebras*. Commun. Math. Phys. **118** (1988), 171-176
- [66] Ocneanu, A.: *Quantized group, string algebras and Galois theory for algebras*. In: Operator algebras and applications, Vol. 2 (Warwick, 1987), (ed. D. E. Evans and M. Takesaki), London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series Vol. 136, Cambridge University Press, (1988) 119-172.
- [67] Ocneanu, A.: *Paths on Coxeter diagrams: From Platonic solids and singularities to minimal models and subfactors*. (Notes recorded by S. Goto) In: Rajarama Bhat, B.V. et al. (eds.), Lectures on operator theory, The Fields Institute Monographs, Providence, Rhode Island: AMS publications 2000, pp. 243-323
- [68] Ocneanu, A.: *The classification of subgroups of quantum $SU(N)$* Quantum Symmetries in Theoretical Physics and Mathematics, editors R.Coquereaux et al. Contemporary Mathematics, AMS to appear
- [69] Ocneanu, A.: *Lectures at Kyoto and MSRI, Berkeley*. December 2000.
- [70] Petkova, V.B., Zuber, J.-B.: *From CFT to graphs*. Nucl. Phys. **B463** (1996), 161-193
- [71] Petkova, V.B., Zuber, J.-B.: *Conformal field theory and graphs*. In: Proceedings Goslar 1996 "Group 21". hep-th/9701103
- [72] Petkova, V.B., Zuber, J.-B.: *Generalized twisted partition functions*. hep-th/0011021
- [73] Petkova, V.B., Zuber, J.-B.: *Conformal field theories, graphs and quantum algebras*. hep-th/0108236
- [74] Petkova, V.B., Zuber, J.-B.: *Boundary conditions in charge conjugate $sl(n)$ WZW theories* hep-th 0201239
- [75] Popa, S.: *An axiomatization of the lattice of higher relative commutants of a subfactor*. Invent. Math. **120** (1995) 427-445
- [76] Rehren, K.-H.: *Braid group statistics and their superselection rules*. In: Kastler, D. (ed.): *The algebraic theory of superselection sectors*. Palermo 1989, Singapore: World Scientific, 1990, pp. 333-355
- [77] Rehren, K.-H.: *Space-time fields and exchange fields*. Commun. Math. Phys. **132** (1990), 461-483
- [78] Rehren, K.-H.: *Subfactors and coset models*. In: Dobrev, V. et al (eds.): *Generalized symmetries in physics*. Singapore: World Scientific, 1994, pp. 338-356

- [79] Rehren, K.-H.: *Chiral observables and modular invariants*. Commun. Math. Phys. **208** (2000), 689-712
- [80] Rehren, K.-H.: *Canonical tensor product subfactors*. Commun. Math. Phys. **211** (2000), 395-406
- [81] Rehren, K.-H., Stanev, Y.S., Todorov, I.T.: *Characterizing invariants for local extensions of current algebras*. Commun. Math. Phys. **174** (1996), 605-633
- [82] Roberts, J.E.: *Local cohomology and superselection structure*. Commun. Math. Phys. **51** (1976), 107-119
- [83] Schellekens A.N., Yankielowicz, S.: *Extended chiral algebras and modular invariant partition functions*. Nucl. Phys. **B327** (1989), 673-703
- [84] Schellekens A.N., Yankielowicz, S.: *Field identification fixed points in the coset construction*. Nucl. Phys. **B334** (1990), 67-102
- [85] Turaev, V.G.: *Quantum invariants of knots and three manifolds* Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter 1994
- [86] Verlinde, E.: *Fusion rules and modular transformations in 2D conformal field theory*. Nucl. Phys. **B300** (1988), 360-376
- [87] Verstegen, D.: *New exceptional modular invariant partition functions for simple Kac-Moody algebras*. Nucl. Phys. **B346** (1990), 349-386
- [88] Wassermann, A.: *Operator algebras and conformal field theory III: Fusion of positive energy representations of $LSU(N)$ using bounded operators*. Invent. Math. **133** (1998), 467-538
- [89] Xu, F.: *Orbifold construction in subfactors*. Commun. Math. Phys. **166** (1994), 237-253
- [90] Xu, F.: *New braided endomorphisms from conformal inclusions*. Commun. Math. Phys. **192** (1998), 347-403